



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/580,139

05/19/2006

Leon Rudakov

077567-0021

9222

31824 7590 04/17/2009
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
18191 VON KARMAN AVE.
SUITE 500
IRVINE, CA 92612-7108

EXAMINER

DORNBUSCH, DIANNE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3773

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/580,139	Applicant(s) RUDAKOV ET AL.	
	Examiner DIANNE DORNBUSCH	Art Unit 3773	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DIANNE DORNBUSCH. (3) ____.

(2) JAMES HILL. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 14 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-13, 15-22, 24-36 and 39-76.

Identification of prior art discussed: Fierens et al. (2002/0035394), Rudakov et al. (6,451,050), Solovay (5,769,884), Dereume et al. (5,948,018).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant wanted to discuss the 112 rejection and the difference between the art of record and applicants invention. The applicant pointed out that none of the cited references seem to show a uniform porosity.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Dianne Dornbusch/ Examiner, Art Unit 3773	/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773
---	---